[The Deputy Chairman]

V. Narasimha Rao, will make a suo motu statement today at 15.30 hrs. regarding espionage activities of two officials of the Pakistan Embassy.

COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Madam, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 24th November, 1988. The Bill seeks to make two changes in the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952. Firstly, a specific provision is being inserted in the Act itself to enable the Commissions of Inquiry to appoint assessors and make payment of travelling and daily allowance to assessors and witnesses.

Secondly, the existing procedure for taking cognisance of the offence relating to accused doing any act calculated to bring a Commission of Inquiry or any member thereof into disrepute is being streamlined.

At present rule 5, sub-rule 6 and rule 6, clauses (a) and (d) of the Commissions of Inquiry Rules, 1972 make provision for the payment of travelling and other expenses.

The Committee on Subordinate Legislation, Sixth Lok Sabha in its Ninth Report and subsequently in its Nineteenth Report recommendde that a suitable provision should be made in the Act itself. Clause 2 of the Bill seeks to insert new section 5B in the Act to authorise the Commission to appoint assessors and pay TA and DA to them.

Clause 4 of the Bill seeks to confer on the appropriate Government power to make rules relating to payment of TA and other expenses payable to assessors and witnesses.

Madam, the need has been felt to streamline the procedure for punishment of persons doing acts calculated to bring the Commission into disrepute under the procedure specified in section 10A of the Act. The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure will apply. The Commission will forward its complaint to the Magistrate who will commit the person to a Court of Sessions for trial. No prosecution can be launched except with the previous sanction of the appropriate Government. It is proposed to change this procedure.

Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to amend section 10A of the Act. Sub-section 1 of Section 10A is retained and the procedure contained in the other subsection is sought to be changed. Under the new procedure the trial will be by the High Court on a complaint made by the Commission of Inquiry or a person authorised on its behalf.

Madam, I commend this Bill for consideration of the august House.

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Jethmalani, your party has got only 10 minutes' time and you have given two names, that is, yourself and Mr. Satya Prakash Malaviya.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Karnataka): Madam, I hope 10 minutes can be extended with your grace to a little longer.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is ten minutes. You can take one or two minutes more and not more than that. There is limitation on extension.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, not more than that.

Madam Deputy Chairman, it might surprise the hon. Minister that I substantially support this amendment. These Commissions of Inquiry have to serve the purpose for which they are designed. They must have what we call in common parlance teeth and I am very happy that this amendment has been brought forward. I support every part of it except one small portion which I hope has been introduced due to carelessness or due to bad drafting or due to some misconception and it is not intentional. What I am referring to is the proviso which has been added to clause 5 of the present third clause of the amendment which provides: "that the personal attendance of a Member of a Commission as a complainant or otherwise is not required." Now, it seems to me that some provisions in the existing law have been misunderstood. The existing provision in the Criminal Procedure Code is that when the complaint is filed by a public servant at the time of the issue of process, in the first instance, presence of the public servant is not required. It is assumed that proper investigation has been done and material collected which is sufficient for sustaining the complaint. But to immunise a complainant from appearing at any time in court and facing cross-examination, to my mind, is either an unintentional misunderstanding of this provision or if it is intentional, then with respect, it is terribly mischievous. It is so mischievous that it will be repugnant to article 21 of the Constitution of Inida. After all, Madam, the main section, section 10A, Clause 1, makes it an offence to indulge in action consisting of statements or conduct which brings a Commission of Enquiry or an individual member thereof into disrepute. In other words, it refers to those kinds of contemptuous references to the Commission or its members which lower its dignity and authority and generally interfere with the efficacious working of a Commission. Now, in an offence of this kind, it is understood on high authority that truth is a complete defence. For example, if you say of a member of the Commission that he has a particular interest in the question involved or that he otherwise is biased in a particular manner or that he has been otherwise guilty of conduct which renders him unfit for holding the office of the member of the Commission, then a true statement on that score cannot possibly be considered an offence. Now if truth is a defence, then that truth can only, in some cases only, and in some cases substantially, be determined only by cross-examination of the complainant and I do not believe that you can sustain a provision by which you can permanently provide that a complainant shall never face the interrogation of those whom he seeks to accuse of an offence. This will be both unfair and repugnant to article 21 of the Constitution of India. Madam, section 10A itself was introduced, for the first time, in 1971. Why it was introduced in 1971, I shall go into it in a few minutes. But it is significant that when section 10A was introduced, there was no such provision corresponding to the present proviso. This proviso is an innovation. Now, in fact the Commission of Inquiry Act was passed in 1952. From 1952, the Legislature never found it necessary to have anything like 10A but I will assume that 10A became necessary in 1971 for some reasons but even when the Legislature found it necessary to bring in 10A and 10A (2), which is now sought to be replaced, they never had the proviso exempting the complainant or the person who initiates the proceedings, from appearance in court. Even judges of the High Court or judges of the Supreme Court in suitable cases, if they file complaints, they are liable to appear. Of course, they appear with due dignity. They may be cross-examined in Chamber or some arrangements will be made

(Shri Ram Jethmalani)

which does not bring them into ridicule or otherwise, offend the majesty of the offices which they hold. But to say that he shall not be required to appear in court, to my mind, appears to be a complete frustration of justice and I hope, as I said that this is a matter which is purely unintentional .If this proviso is dropped by the Minister, I support every other amendment. But, Madam, today is an occasion on which we must examine some of the basic features and some of the ills which are afflicting the institution of Commission of Enquiry and have brought the Commission of Enquiry into disrepute. You will recall, Madam, that 10A itself was introduced in 1971 and historically, if you recall that 1971 was the time just 1 P.M. the time when the hated doctrine of committed judiciary was first evolved in this country and circulated. Once it became a fashion to have committed Judges, attacks on Judges also became fashionable and were a necessary consequence of that doctrine because if you bring in Judges who are committed to one side or the other, it is then obvious that from the other side you will invite criticism and since that criticism was beginning to become manifest and was becoming sometimes a daily occurrence, section 10A was brought into existence. In fact, section 10A is a reflection of a disease, decline in judicial standards. Madam, it is a matter of regret. I have been a lawyer and have practised for nearly 50 years. There was a time when even a thought did not cross the mind of a lawyer that the Judge sitting in the High Court or the Supreme Court or even the Sessions Court could be a Judge against whose integrity or character something could be alleged and it could be suspected. Never never did we even imagine, at even the wildest of moments that such a thing was possible But it is unfortunate that after 1971 standards have very very significantly declined. The rot had started earlier, but by 1971 it was completed by the hated doctrine which came into vogue.

Now, Madam, I would like to ask the Minister to consider this. This is not a matter of party politics because tomorrow you will be out of office and Commissions of inquiry will be appointed by the new Government which comes into vogue. (*Interruptions*). So, I want you to... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If wishes were horses...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I want you to consider this from the point of view of the permanent statute book of the country. You have experienced before. In fact, the Supreme Court was told that commissions of inquiry were always appointed against the outgoing politicians by the incoming politicians and the Supreme Court said that it was inevitable because no Government was going to appoint a Commission of inquiry against itself on disputed questions of integrity and so on. So, that is a matter which is too well known. Madam, I would like to suggest this. Sometimes we have commissions of inquiry dealing with matters which are non-political or non-controversial in nature like commissions of inquiry inquirng into natural disasters, calamities failure of commercial undertakings and so on and so forth in which no politics is involved. But wherever questions of a political nature are involved wherever questions which heat up and raise political controversies and political tempers are involved. I suggest that it is time that all sections of this House agreed that a convention should be developed that those who preside over the commissions of inquiry must be appointed not by the Government on its own but must be appointed with the consent and the concurrence and consultation of all sections of political parties involved. If you

develop a voluntary convention of this kind that when you appoint a commissioner, that commissioner must meet the approval, formally or informally according to the method of consultation evolved, and if you do adopt this kind of convention, you will see that there will be no attacks upon the integrity of commissioners and commissions of inquiry and section 10A itself will become redundant as indeed it was redundant from 1952 to 1971. As I said, in 1971 the need for section 10A itself arose because of the visible decline of judicial standards. When there is visible decline in judicial standards it is again not a matter of party politics. It is noted by commissions, law commissions; it is noted in seminars; it is noted by various organizations which are dealing with human rights and human liberties; so many non-governmental organizations have debated this question. And today, we are almost in a state of public confession that judicial standards have declined.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: But, how do you deal with compulsive critics? My hon. friend called even M.Ps in one of his interviews How do you deal with a situation like that?

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): Does the cap fit you? (*Interruption*). Only you are objecting. It is only your objection. We do not object, we do not disturb, when you are making a speech. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Chidambaram can answer him. Mr. Chidambaram does not need you. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DEASI (Maharashtra): That is not his point,...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I know what he wants to say. He is calling an honourable Member of this House a compulsive critic. It is a breach of privilege. You cannot do it. You are a compulsive sycophant.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): I am not. You don't know the meaning and difference between (*Interruption*)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I don't remember the context in which I had called somebody a rascal. But there are some ** ** There is no question...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He had said it about MPs.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Why bring in irrelevant things? We are discussing a serious topic.....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All of us are Members of Parliament. How can anyone be anything else?

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Madam, I seek your protection. If Members start accusing each other where do we end up? Everybody is an elected Member. How is a particular elected Member different from the others?

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN (Kerala): I am on a point of order. Such a kind of accusing is not proper. Can any Member of this House be allowed to say another member is not suitable to be a Member of this House? I want a clear ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But nobody said any such thing Yes, Mr. Jethmalani, your time is getting over.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): He says he does not remember where he had said it. In *Gentlemen* of June issue there is an interview by him and there he said it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: It has nothing to do with the proceedings of this House. They can sue him outside if they like.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He said standards are deteriorating. In that context I said...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Even the standard of our debate is deteriorating.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought Mr Jethmalani takes other people's cases. I never knew he needs your protection.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: If Chidambaram needs Bansal, then I at least can certainly support Ram.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You continue, Mr. Jethmalani.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Some young Members of this House feel that an old man like me needs protection. I don't mind Kamal coming to my rescue.

I have no desire to cross swords with anybody. If there is a matter about Gentlemen to be discussed anytime I am willing to discuss about it but this is not the occasion. Why bring in time-barred things, old things?....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you are getting time barred!

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I say this that the Government must have a serious look at the time of personnel which we employ for the purpose of these commissions of inquiry and it is a matter on which there may be controversy. But I am entitled to express my opinion and in the exercise of my freedom I do wish to suggest that the standards of the commissions of inquiry have gone down and some commisions of inquiry which have functioned in the recent past have not behaved as would behove judges and the cadres from which they are originally drawn. Some commissions of inquiry have behaved like bonded labour and the answers to be returned to the questions put before the commissions are a matter which can be easily predicted long before the commission have started working. And in the case of the latest commision which has brought about this, in fact, the proposals are based up on the suggestions made by a commission and that itself is a commission which, according to me, was the last straw on the camel's back and which brought the greatest disgrace to the institution of commisions of inquiry. And if these things are taken care of by the Government and a consensus evolved, I think this is a welcome measure and I extend to it the fullest possible support but in the spirit in which I have made my comments and I hope these comments will be heeded to by the Minister.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Well, I hope it Madam Deputy Chairperson, I rise to support this Bill. I still remember my young days at the bar. The Mundhra Commission which was...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which bar?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Well, I hope it would not be long before we have one in the Central Hall here.

As a member of the legal profession, when in the Mundhra case, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed which was presided over by Mr. Justice Chagla, we used to go to the Bombay Legislative Assembly Hall outside where the proceedings were held and I still fondly remember, and remember with a certain amount of pride, that all that was exposed was by one of the Congress members, the late Feroz Gandhi, who was responsible for the appointment of that Commission and for the exposure of that scandal.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I think that man should be remembered more and more now.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: And, Madam, that Report is well-known. Since

then, this institution of Commission of Inquiry has come into existence. I myself appeared in almost every important Commission of Inquiry.

I appeared, I remember, before Mr. Justice Naik, who constituted the Commission of Inquiry, to go into the breach of the Panchet Dam.

Then, I appeared before the Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Commission which was presided over by Mr. Justice Chandrachud who, later on became the Chief Justice of India. But, for the first time, a Commmission of Inquiry, which is a fair inquiry to ascertain the truth of a matter of public importance, was really perverted by those who succeeded us in 1977 and again, I appeared before every Commission of Inquiry that they appointed.

I appeared before the Shah Commission and I appeared before the Gupta Commission. My learned friend crossed swords with me in the Reddy Commision and I do not know why he disappeared after some time from that Commission of Inquiry. But they converted every Commissions of Inquiry into Star Chambers and it is really surprising that my honourable friend should now really rise to criticise the process of which he was himself the author and architect in a very very big way.

Scandalising the Judges has become the fashion with some of them and scandalising the Members of Parliament has become a fashion with many of them. It is very easy to call names, but difficult to preserve institutions. difficult to show respect, inherent respect, which is in-built in the system itself, whether it be for the High Court Judges or whether it be for the Supreme Court Judges or wether it be for those high-placed individuals who would perform their duties, constituting the Commision of Inquiry. It is, therefer, a matter of regret that the honourable Member, who is otherwise in agreement with this, should use this occasion to say something. In 1971, there was no talk of any committed judiciary at all. Factually he is wrong. All this talk came only after the supersession of Judges in 1973. Anyway, it suits him and he can twist the facts. But I must tell that one should not be ashamed at all if the judiciary is committed to what is contained in the Constitution, if the judiciary is committed to the Preamble of the Constitution, if the judiciary is committed to Part III of the Constitution and, more so, if it is committed to Part IV of the Constitution, because that is the very basis on which we founded our claim, the Congress Party founded its claim, and on which we framed this Constitution. And, Madam, I am not ashamed when we are talking about Judges who are committed to the Constitution, who are doing nothing outside the Constitution or otherwise. The honourable Member always brings in some such things and he suffers from this persecution ania. He thinks of Commissions of Inquiry like the Shah Commission which was he'd by the Delhi High Court to have been acting as a Star Chamber. He thinks of bringing in the Special Courts Bill and his stand is very clear. But I must say that if at that time the judiciary was also brought into disrepute, it was also because of some of the activities of the politicians at that time. Some of the judgements which were given then by some of the Judges, during the tenure of the Janata regime, indicated that they were under pressure. And, therefore let us not get into this. Let us maintain the respect of the highest judiciary. Speaking on this Bill, I feel that though this protection is necessary, the amendment has not come a day too soon. I am personally of the opinion and let the entire House agree with me that let no sitting Judge ever sit on a Commission of Inquiry. We have adequate talent of retired Judges who are independent who are objective, who can be utilized. But it has become a fashion with some of them that when a Commission goes on a course which

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

is not to their liking then they go on condemning that Commission. And I have not seen a more unfair criticism, a motivated criticism, a politically motivated criticism, of Commissions of Inquiry. Therefore, I do not subscribe to what has been said. If the protection is given to those who perform, then the proviso to section 5 is also necessary. Of course, it says that his personal attendance is not necessary. But if in a trial a stage arises where it is necessary for him to go, otheriwse something very drastic will result against that person concerned, I do not think that any self-respecting man will avoid getting into the box and facing cross-examination. But this protection is necessary in the first instance. I do not think it creates a bar at all. But it will of course not help the hon. Member, at the slightest pretext on frivolous excuses, to lift his pen or tongue and lash against that high dignitary and cross-examine him, so that in fact it would be a threat which would really negate the very spirit and the very purpose of this Constitution. I do not want to say much. But I do want to say that in a recent judgement of the Supreme Court it has been held that even if a person is guilty of perjury the Commission of Inquiry does not have the power to file a prosecution against him. I think this is also inconsistent Just as we have now lifted the bar of permission of the Government, I think what is necesary is that we should permit the Commission of Inquiry itself or an officer authorised by the Commission of Inquiry to file a prosecution of perjury.

But by and large this institution of Commission of Inquiry has served us well, In a democracy where we have to ascertain the truth, truth of a matter of public importance, where we have to go into the causes of several maladies which afflict our society, where we have, in the light of those findings of the truth and those various lapses and deficiencies, to chart a future course of action, can't say that any attempt to keep Commissions of Inquiry free from any sort of vilification of attack or any sort of provision which will put in on the same footing as a court, is really unjustified and uncalled for. I think the hon. Member has totally misunderstood the scope of the proviso. I think there is overzealousness in these matters. If he has said something agianst Members of Parliament, I think you say it firstly because the cap fits you and, therefore, you try to deflect the attention by trying to involve somebody else. But this is an occasion which I take to emphasize that we must keep our respect for the institutions, we must keep our respect for the high individuals, and not get lost in the passions of petty politics, which really serve nobody, either the society or the institutions which are meant to serve the society.

SHRI NARREDDY THULASI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am at a loss to know whether to laugh or to cry at this sinister move of the Congress (I) ruled Central Government or the Union Government in bringing back the effects of the Defamation Bill through backdoor methods by introducing this Commisions of Inquiry (Amendment) Bill, 1988. Madam, is it not a mini Defamation Bill? Does it not constitute an infringement of the freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of thought? It will not be out of place to remind this Government about the expression of anger by the citizens and the press on the eve of the introduction of the Defamation Bill. Madam, the introduction of the Commissions of Inquiry (Amendment) Bill may lead to a similar situation in the days to come.

Coming to the Bill, I would say that the provisions about the assessors was there in the rules. Now the

provision has been included in the Bill. It is a welcome feature.

Regarding sub-sections 2 and 4 of section 10-A, I would say that previously they were provided in the rules. Now, they have been made a part of the Bill itself basing on the recommendations of the Committee on subordinate Legislation. They are innocuous sub-sections.

Madam, sub-section 3 is the most dangerous one. In the Statement of Objects, it has not been made clear as to how it is going to better the existing provisions. According to the present Bill, even a fly cannot land on the members of the Commission of Inquiry. The High Courts can take action against those people or papers against whom the members of the Commision of Inquiry have given a complaint in writing. Madam, according to the original Act, the members of the Commission of Inquiry had to take the permission of the Central Government or the State Government which had appointed them before executing prosecution. Thus, the Government is trying to give immunity to the members of the Commission of Inquiry from criticism which is not available even to the President or the Prime Minister of this country. Of course, I do not know. Tomorrow this may also be done and there will be no wonder.

It seems that the Government has been inspired by the report of the Thakkar-Natarajan Commission on Fairfax. Everybody knows that these two learned Judges have been criticised very severely and even the Commission has issued notices to some of the dailies asking them to explain as to why action should not be taken against them under Section 10-A of this Act. Fortunately, no action has been initiated by the Public Prosecutors as required under Section 10A(2) against any of the dailies. It is the Thakkar-Natarajan Commission which has recommended that the members of the Commission of Inquiry should be given powers so that their defamation is also treated as contempt of court. Madam, in this context, may I submit that it is not a provision which preserves the self-respect and dignity of the members, but it is the manner in which they perform their duties. In this context, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an important observation made by Shri H. M. Seerwani in his article published in the Indian Express dated 30th December, 1987. He said, and I quote:

> "If the manner in which the two Member Thakkar-Natarajan Commission conducted its inquiry has met with withering criticism, and its report has been condemned by competent opinion outside the ruling party, the fault must lie not in the Commissions of Inquiry Act, but in the manner in which the two Judges conducted their inquiry and made their report."

So, Madam... (*Interruption*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They want to enquire whether it is Mr. Seervai or Mr Sherwani.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Seervai.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said Mr. Sherwani.

SHRI NARREDDY THULASI REDDY: Madam, in this context, I would like to mention that Mr. Thakkar was rewarded with the Chairmanship of the Law Commission as he has submitted his report in favour of the ruling party at the Centre. Madam, once accepted to become a member of a Commission of Inquiry, even the Supreme Court Judge will become an

[Shri Narreddy Thulasi Reddy]

ordinary man. Madam, the Supreme Court has given its judgment that the Commission of Inquiry is not a court. So, for an ordinary man, this contempt of court will not abide.

Next, Madam, this Act was originally intended to serve the public purpose. But if we take a review of the various Commissions appointed under this Act by the State Governments or the Central Government, we find that many times this Act has been more misused than properly used. Nowadays, it is synonymous that whenever a public issue has to be solved or when a burning topic has to be shut into the cold storage, resort is made under this Act to constitute a Commission. The Commission takes its own time and then the recommendation are sent to the respective Departments, and these reports gather dust there. (*Time bell rings*) Madam 80 per cent of the reports of the Commissions are gathering dust in various Departments. So, the findings of the Commission are not made final and they are not made binding They can again be subjected to review. If the findings of the Commission are inconvenient or against the interest of the ruling political party—whether it is the Centre or the State. I do not brother—they are never published. So, the net result will be that these Commissions are subserving the interests of the party in power. Madam, the notorious example is the prevention of publication of the Thakkar Commission Report on Indira Gandhi Assassination. Even the Commission on Kiran Bedi did not serve any purpose. Moreover, it has created additional tension.

Therefore, Madam, in this context, I would like to mention that this Act should be amended so that certain well-established criteria are defined as to when a Commission can be appointed, and once a Commission is appointed and the findings are arrived it, they must have some binding effect. Otherwise, most of these Commissions will become a farce. Madam, there must be an amendment to the Act preventing sitting Judges of the Supreme Court or the High Courts from being appointed on a Commission of Inquiry. This will preserve the values of the institution of courts. In this connection, Madam, may I mention that even the British Lord Chancellor Hailsham said that the sitting Judges of the Supreme Court or the High Courts should not accept to be the members of the Commission of Inquiry:

Finally, Madam, before concluding my speech, as a citizen of this great democratic country, it is my bounden duty, it is my primary responsibility to oppose, to protest against this ill-advised, ill-conceived, undemocratic, unconstitutional and unfortunate Bill which will suppress the fundamental rights of freedom of speech, freedom of expression, freedom of thought and the freedom of press. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the House stands adjourned for lunch till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock, **The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai)** in the Chair.

Commissions of Enquiry (Amendment) Bill 1988—Contd.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chaiman, Sir, I rise to support the Bill, the Commission of Inquiry (Amendment) Bill, 1988. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is a simple Bill which contains an important provision, namely, the amendment of section 10A of the principal Act. Sir, commissions of inquiry have been ordered and commission have been appointed in various States. Especially most of the Chief Ministers have appointed commissions to inquire into allegations against them.